

Early Journal Content on JSTOR, Free to Anyone in the World

This article is one of nearly 500,000 scholarly works digitized and made freely available to everyone in the world by JSTOR.

Known as the Early Journal Content, this set of works include research articles, news, letters, and other writings published in more than 200 of the oldest leading academic journals. The works date from the mid-seventeenth to the early twentieth centuries.

We encourage people to read and share the Early Journal Content openly and to tell others that this resource exists. People may post this content online or redistribute in any way for non-commercial purposes.

Read more about Early Journal Content at http://about.jstor.org/participate-jstor/individuals/early-journal-content.

JSTOR is a digital library of academic journals, books, and primary source objects. JSTOR helps people discover, use, and build upon a wide range of content through a powerful research and teaching platform, and preserves this content for future generations. JSTOR is part of ITHAKA, a not-for-profit organization that also includes Ithaka S+R and Portico. For more information about JSTOR, please contact support@jstor.org.

THE HEYWOOD CIRCLE AND THE REFORMATION[1]

By using the rather pretentious title above I do not wish to imply that I intend to treat exhaustively the various fortunes that befell John Heywood and his Catholic friends and relatives in the course of the Reformation in England. My object is rather to present a series of notes which, I believe, will clarify certain minor points in the career of Heywood, and which taken together will strengthen the evidence pointing to the dramatist's youthful residence at North Mimms in Hertsfordshire and his early admission to the group which clustered around Sir Thomas More. Naturally we should expect the various members of this remarkable circle, drawn together by common intellectual interests and bound to one another by intermarriage and a common religion, to have experienced similar fortunes. That such was the case will appear in the following pages. Especially interesting to us is the apparent intimacy that existed between Heywood and the other members of the group throughout these experiences.

According to an early writer, John Heywood was introduced to the court by Sir Thomas More, an admirer of his musical talent and witty conversation. That he was for a long time intimately associated with Sir Thomas there can be no doubt, since Stapleton in acknowledging the sources of his information for the *Vita*[2] of More mentions together with Jno. Clement, Wm. Rastell, and others "Joannes quoque Haiwodus quo per aliquot annos familiariter Thomas Morus usus fuerat"; and whatever may have occasioned Heywood's connection with the court, it is virtually certain that he enjoyed more or less favor at the hands of Henry VIII.

Before presenting the indications of royal favor, however, we may note that there are obviously several John Heywoods mentioned

[1] I am unwilling to publish this article without expressing my thanks to Professor J. M. Manly for several valuable suggestions and for the loan of books. I wish also to acknowledge my indebtedness to Professor C. R. Baskervill for whom the paper was originally prepared.

[2] *Tres Thomae*, ed. of 1612, p. 152. The work appeared originally at Douay in 1588. The words *Multis annis familiarissimus*, which John Pits later used to describe Heywood's relationship to More (cf. *Eng. Stud.*, XXXVIII, 237), are also of interest in this connection.

in government documents between 1520 and 1558. In some cases, therefore, we cannot be certain that the dramatist is concerned.[1] The situation is further complicated by the fact that the name Heywood is sometimes spelled Hayward and vice versa.[2]

Under the circumstances, then, we are not quite sure that the "singer" is referred to when we read among the grants of February, 1521, that "John Haywod, the King's servant," was granted an annuity of ten marks "as had by Th. Farthyng, deceased, out of the issues of the Manors of Makesey and Torpull, Northt." (*L. and P.*,[3] III, Pt. 1, p. 445). Collier, taking this to be a certain reference to the dramatist, could not understand why a few years later Heywood should be receiving quarter wages of 50*s*. His explanation was that Heywood after receiving the annuity was made Master of certain children, hence his salary as singer was reduced to £10 annually.[4] Collier did not know, however, that in April of the same year the annuity of 10 marks was declared invalid (*L. and P.*, III, Pt. 1, p. 479). The quarterly payments of 50*s*. to "John Heywood player at virginals" which confused Collier are explained by the following grant: "To John Haywood, upon a warrant dated November 8, 20 Henry VIII, for his pension of 10£ a year, to be paid quarterly from Michaelmas last, 50*s*." (*L. and P.*, V, 306). Quarter wages of 50*s*. to "John Haywood, player on the virginals," are recorded at various times from March, 1529, to Christmas, 1545.[5]

[1] Some references may be cited. In December, 1520, "John Haywood, singer" was paid 100*s*. (*Letters and Papers of Henry VIII*, ed. by Brewer and Gairdner, III, Pt. 2, p. 1543). There can hardly be any doubt here. Among the disbursements for the same year, however, a "John Haiwode, yeoman of the crown," is paid for bringing news from Ireland (*ibid.*, Pt. I, p. 499), and in 1523 and 1526 a "John Haywod" was collecting rents for Sir Adrian Fortescue (*ibid.*, III, Pt. 2, p. 1317; IV, Pt. 3, p. 3116). In a document of August 8, 1544, of "the wages paid to labourers sent into France" a "John Heywood" is given as one of the captains of the men (*ibid.*, XIX, Pt. 2, p. 20).

[2] Two interesting cases may be noted. Wriothesley in writing of Heywood's recantation in 1544 speaks of "Hayward" (*Chronicle*, I, 148). In 1604 Dean Sutcliffe accused Robert Parsons of being the bastard son of "Haywood" who was "in his time a mad ieasting knave" (cf. *Miscellany of Catholic Record Society*, II, 43). The dean has reference to John Hayward who after receiving the living of Nether Stowey, Somersetshire, discovered Parsons and sent him to school. See E. L. Taunton, *Hist. of the Jesuits in Eng.*, p. 14, where the form John Heywood is retained.

[3] Hereafter the abbreviation *L. and P.* will be used for Brewer's *Letters and Papers of the Reign of Henry VIII*.

[4] *Annals of Stage*,[2] I, 73–74.

[5] *L. and P.*, V, 309; XIII, Pt. 2, p. 528; XVI, 184, 704; XVII, 478; XX, Pt. 2, p. 515.

Other items are more doubtful. A letter dated July 28, 1539, from John Whederykke, clerk, late of St. Osith's, concerns a farm and is addressed to "John Heywoode, gent," (*L. and P.*, XIV, Pt. 1, p. 577). On November 21, 1540, a "John Heywood" leased the Manor of Brokehall, Essex,[1] in the king's hands by the attainder of Thos. Crumwell, for 21 years, at 14£ 18*d.* rent and 18*d.* increase" (*L. and P.*, XVI, 172). Possibly the same person is recorded, January 10, 1533, in the following list of recipients of plate, the receivers of New Year's gifts from the king: "To the Earl of Wiltshire, Thos. Hermage, the bp. of Ely, Sir John Daunce, Sir Francis Brian,—Heywood, lord Dacris of the South, etc." Along with such worthies appear "Anth. Toote, graver," "Vincent, clock-maker," and others (*L. and P.*, VI, 14). With such records should be compared the grant by the crown to John Heywood on November 10, 1558, of the lease of Bolmer Manor and other property in Yorkshire at a rent of £30 (*Cal. of State Papers, Domestic*, 1547–80, p. 112).

Other documents are concerned with less important matters. On November 4, 1541, a "tenement, &c., in tenure of John Haywoode, and formerly leased to Thos. Yong, in the parish of St. Peter in Woodstreete," was granted by the crown to Morgan Phillipp, the king's goldsmith (*L. and P.*, XVI, 576). On June 23, 1545, "two messuages" in "tenure of John Heywood and John Coke in Whitechurch parish, Dors.," were granted to Wm. Beryff and John Multon (*L. and P.*, XX, Pt. 1, p. 661). In the same year land in Burstall, Oxon, in the tenure of "John Heywoodde" and others was turned over to Robt. Browne (*ibid.*, Pt. 2, p. 545). Among the grants of March, 1546, to Geo. Rythe and Thos. Grantham in fee for £1,596 was included property "in tenure of John Haywoodde in Kylby, Leic." (*L. and P.*, XXI, Pt. 1, p. 243).

As was said above, it is not always possible to decide whether the dramatist is really referred to in some of the various documents containing the name of John Heywood; and extreme care should be exercised before stating with assurance when and where he was concerned. Until reliable evidence to show the contrary is brought

[1] It is perhaps worth while to note in this connection that Barnaby Googe in his translation *On Husbandry* quotes Heywood regarding Essex cheese (Hazlitt's ed. of Dodsley, I, 326). On the early fame of Essex cheese-making, see the *Victorian County Histories, Essex*, II, 369–70.

to bear, however, we are perhaps justified in believing that he held considerable crown land in tenure during the reign of Henry VIII, and that he enjoyed a rather prominent place among his fellows. This would be in keeping with the circle in which he moved and the prominent position of his sons at Oxford and elsewhere. And such indications of prosperity and favor are not entirely without interest in connection with his religious experiences.

So far as I have observed, no especial inconvenience seems to have been occasioned the Heywood circle until several years after the death of More. The Six Articles which Henry rather harshly enforced (cf. Maitland, *Essays on the Reformation*, pp. 259–64) could have caused no trouble to the religious consciences of persons with such pronounced Catholic views. Their trouble, it seems, arose from a too sanguine desire to see the Articles employed in the interest of Catholicism, a desire which in 1544 led some of them into serious difficulties with respect to the Act of Supremacy.

Encouraged by the institution of the Six Articles, certain Catholics, prominent among whom were Dr. London, Stephen Gardiner, Serles, and Willoughby, undertook to overthrow Cranmer, archbishop of Canterbury. Much evidence against him was collected and elaborate accusations were drawn up.[1] Owing, however, to Henry VIII's staunch friendship for the archbishop, the commission which was to seek out his misdeeds was changed, as it were, into a commission with the archbishop at its head to inquire into the "confederacy" of the plotters.[2] Cranmer's commission began its operations in August, 1543, but after sitting for six weeks it accomplished nothing owing to the fact that the chief agents, Cocks and Hussey, were secretly favorable to the Papists. But Morice, the archbishop's secretary, seeing the state of affairs, wrote to Dr. Butts. As a result of his letter Dr. Leigh and Dr. Rowland Taylor were appointed at the head of a new commission to investigate Kentish conditions. In a few hours the whole plot was unearthed, and heaps of damning papers were accumulated and carried to Lambeth for the king's perusal. The chief agents against Cranmer were thrown into prison and kept there until early in 1544 when most of them were

[1] Summarized in Strype, *Memorials of Cranmer*, I, 167–69.

[2] For full accounts see Strype, *Cranmer*, I, 144–77; Pollard, *Cranmer*, pp. 147–56; Dixon, *Church Hist.*, II, 334–38; *L. and P.*, XVIII, Pt. 2, pp. 291–378.

liberated as the result of a general pardon granted by Parliament, a pardon, says Morice, secured by the great labor of "thair frendes."

Following the decidedly prejudiced accounts of Morice, Foxe, and Strype, some historians have stressed the ease with which the plotters escaped punishment. But this was not entirely the case. As a result of the agitation Symonds, London, and Ockham were deservedly punished. Bishop Gardiner lost permanently the king's favor. Others who had been so unfortunate as to involve themselves with the Act of Supremacy, either directly or indirectly, as a result of the investigation, were dealt with most harshly. Germain Gardiner, Jno. Larke, and Ireland were executed; Heywood barely escaped.

After this brief and general account of the plot against Cranmer, let us turn to a more detailed discussion of the part played by Heywood and his friends in the Kentish agitation. "The chief witnesses" against the archbishop, says Strype,[1] "and the persons concerned as vouchers and informers were Roper, Balthazar, a surgeon, Heywood, Moor, Beckinsal, Germain Gardiner." This seems to have been the case; and in a set of "Interrogatories" drawn up by Cranmer in 1543 to be used against Jno. Parkehurst, the first question reads: "First, what communication by word or writing you had with Mr. Roper, Balthasar the Surgeon, Heywode, Mr. Moore, Jermen Gardiner, Mr. Bekensale, or with either of them, and to what effect such communication hath been" (*L. and P.*, XVIII, Pt. 2, pp. 297–98). The same set of questions asks what communication was had "with the chancellor of London, Dr. Cole or Dr. Clemen,[2] and my lord of Winchester's chaplain, Mr. Medowes, touching my Lord's Grace, Dr. London, these new opinions or enormities in Kent." As will be shown later, the former friends of Sir Thomas More are well represented in the list of names above. The retaliatory accusations urged against them seem to have been somewhat varied; their fortunes were especially so.

That the "Mr. Moore" mentioned above was John More, son of Sir Thomas, is revealed by the grant of April 24, 1544, when "John More of *Chelsith, Midd.*, alias of Bamburgh, Yorks., alias

[1] *Memorials of Cranmer*, I, 169.

[2] Doctor John Clement the physician, friend and protégé of More.

of London," was pardoned of "all treasonable words with the detestable traitors, John Eldryngton, Germain Gardyner, John Bekynsale, John Heywood, Wm. Daunce, John Larke, clerk, John Ireland, clerk, Roger Ireland, clerk, with restoration of goods" (*L. and P.*, XIX, Pt. 1, p. 285). Here Heywood is associated with other members of the More circle—Wm. Daunce, the husband of More's daughter, Elizabeth, John Larke, the parish priest of Sir Thomas, and John Ireland, his chaplain.

Some of the persons associated with Heywood seem to have escaped with comparative ease. More and Daunce were duly pardoned.[1] The pardon of John Ireland is dated June 28, 1545.[2] Neither Balthasar the surgeon[3] nor Dr. Clement seems to have been seriously inconvenienced. The latter in the "Augmentations of 1546" is not paid his £3 6*s.* 8*d.* as royal physician (*L. and P.*, XXI, Pt. 1, p. 311; Pt. 2, p. 444), but this was no doubt due to his election in 1544 to the presidency of the College of Physicians.[4]

The "Mr. Roper" of Cramner's "Interrogatories" is of course William Roper, the husband of Sir Thomas More's favorite daughter, Margaret. According to an old writer,[5] his offense was relieving "Maister Bekenshowe, a learned man,"[6] with his alms, as a result

[1] Daunce's pardon is dated April 24, 1544 (*L. and P.*, XIX, Pt. 1, pp. 284–85). Neither More nor Daunce seems to have had further trouble with Henry. In May, 1546, the latter as son and heir of Sir John Daunce was granted the lands held by his father (*ibid.*, XXI, Pt. 2, pp. 243–44); and in a muster-book for the French army in 1544 a John More, probably the one pardoned above, is placed among the king's household as furnishing "2 Billemen, pikes and other" (*ibid.*, XIX, Pt. 1, p. 162). More died in 1547.

[2] *L. and P.*, XX, Pt. I, p. 125.

[3] Balthasar Guersie or Guarsy was an Italian surgeon to Queen Catherine. For the chief facts of his life see Munk, *College of Physicians*, I, 57.

[4] Munk, I, 26.

[5] Cf. Wordsworth, *Ecclesiastical Biography*, II, 121.

[6] In order to correct a mistake which has crept into the *Dict. of Nat. Biog.*, it may be well to point out a few facts in the life of John Bekinsau or Bekynsal. *D.N.B.* after saying that Bekinsau was Greek reader at Paris shortly after 1530, states that "having returned to England, Bekinsau married, and so vacated his fellowship" (IV, 141). Is all of this true? On June 5, 1537, he wrote to Dr. Knight that he expected to return to England *cum pannis* after midsummer (*L. and P.*, XII, Pt. 2, p. 13). This he seems not to have done, since on October 29, 1538, he wrote from Paris to Cromwell that he had married a French woman, "which he did to avoid his friends soliciting him to be a priest" (*ibid.*, XIII, Pt. 2, p. 277). In October, 1539, Cromwell granted "Berkensau, a scholar of Paris," £10 (*ibid.*, XIV, Pt. 2, p. 343; cf. also V, 748–749); and at least as late as October 26 of the same year he was still in Paris (*ibid.*, p. 138). By 1543 he had returned to England, and on May 6, 1544, "John Bekynsawe, of Borowclere, Hants, alias John Beckensall of London," was pardoned of treasonable intercourse in Paris with Reginald

of which he was sent to the Tower. That he was actually imprisoned and released on the payment of a fine is shown by the following entry in the accounts of the king's jewels and plate: "Feb. 29, [154¾] brought in to the King, by Sir Richard Southwell, one of the general surveyors, for the fine of Wm. Roper being in the Tower of London, 100£." (*L. and P.*, XVII, p. 147). He is included in a 1544 list of commissioners for Kent (*ibid.*, XX, Pt. 1, p. 316); and his name appears in the muster-book of August of the same year (*ibid.*, XIX, Pt. 1, p. 152). His subsequent career is well known. He remained in England until his death, gaining a reputation for his charity and suffering various inconveniences on account of his faith and his generosity to his persecuted friends.[1] This sometime radical Protestant who, according to Harpsfield, Stapleton, and Cresacre More, was converted to Catholicism by his father-in-law and wife, remained true to his new religion until the end; and Guzman de Silva writing to the Spanish king on July 10, 1568, stated that Roper's children were all "strong Catholics" (*Cal. State Papers, Spanish*, 1568–79, p. 52).

Others did not fare so well. Germain Gardiner, Bishop Gardiner's secretary, was attainted, and in March, 1544, was executed. On March 8, 1544, Richard Richardson, the king's chaplain, was presented to the parish church of Chelsea,[2] vacant by the attainder of Larke (*L. and P.*, XIX, Pt. 1, p. 175). Together with John Ireland, he had been martyred at Tyburn on March 7 of the same year.[3]

Heywood's experiences were somewhat different from those associated with him in the "Interrogatories." On April 12, 1544, Lord St. John and Sir Edmund Pecham were commissioned "to

Pole and others (*ibid.*, XIX, Pt. 1, pp. 377–78). In 1546 he published, with a dedication to the king, his *De supremo et absoluto regis imperio*, a work which, according to Bale, was written "only for lucre." Whatever may have been Bekinsau's intentions, his book apparently accomplished its purpose, for in 1546 the author was granted a pension (*L. and P.*, XXI, Pt. 1, p. 142) and, it seems, also an annuity of £25 (*ibid.*, p. 148). For his subsequent career see *D.N.B.* and Wood's *Athen Oxon.*, ed. Bliss, I, col. 308.

[1] See Birt, *The Eliz. Religious Settlement*, pp. 517, 434; *Spanish Papers*, 1568–79, p. 52; *D.N.B.*, etc.

[2] Larke was appointed to the rectory of Holy Trinity, Chelsea, on March 29, 1530 (Hennessy's ed. of Newcourt, *Novum repetorium*, p. 120).

[3] Hennessy (*Novum repetorium*, p. xxiii), and others following him, date Larke's execution March 7, 1554/55. This is of course, a slip for 1544. Cf. Bridgett, *Life of More*, p. 143, and Sander, *The Anglican Schism* (trans. of Lewis), p. 155. Sander stated that about the same time Ashby, James Singleton, John Risby, and Thomas Rice were also executed "because they would not acknowledge the royal supremacy."

take the account of Sir Ric. Southwell, one of the General Surveyors, of money, plate, jewels, corn, cattle, and received by him, which came to the King by the deaths of Ric. Nyke, late bishop of Norwich, and of Sir Geo. Lawson, and by the attainders of Jane late Lady Rocheford, Germyn Gardener, late of London, John Haywood, late of London, John Larke, clerk, late parson of Chelsey, Midd., and John Ireland" (*L. and P.*, XIX, Pt. 1, p. 277). Here is a rather grewsome list. But Heywood, it seems, was "not of mind to be a martyr." A general pardon was dated at Westminster, June 26, 1544, and delivered June 30, to "John Heywode, late of London, *alias of Northmymmes*,[1] *Herts.*" (*L. and P.*, XIX, Pt. 1, p. 504). His recantation for denying the king's supremacy was made public at Paul's Cross at the time of the sermon there on Sunday, July 6, 1544 (*ibid.*, p. 532; Foxe, *Acts and Monuments*, ed. 1846, V, 528–29).

[1] This reference to North Mimms together with the offender's repeated association with the More group makes it practically certain that it was the dramatist who got into trouble about the Act of Supremacy. Heywood is said to have made More's acquaintance at Gobions, the latter's seat at North Mimms (*D.N.B.*, XXVI, 331). Here, according to a passage in Peachem's *Thalias Banquet* (1620), More wrote his *Utopia* and Heywood his *Epigrams* (Warton, ed. 1871, IV, 80, note). In his *Compleat Gentleman* Peacham further says that in his birthplace More and Heywood both dwelt and "had fair possessions" (ed. of Gordon, p. 95). There is no doubt about More's owning property at North Mimms. A "messuage called Gobeans [apparently owned by Sir Thomas' father before him] in Northmymnes, Herts.," is mentioned in 1540 among the possessions of Thos. More, attainted (*L. and P.*, XVI, 350). In June, 1546, it was in the king's hands by the death of Alice More (*ibid.*, XXI, Pt. 1, p. 575). After the death of Jno. More his widow "received from Queen Mary a regrant of his grandfather's confiscated property at North Mimms" (*D.N.B.*, XXXVIII, 447). In his will (*Eng. Stud.*, XXXVIII, 238) Wm. Rastell gives to Ellis Heywood the possessions at North Mimms which possibly had been acquired through the marriage of William's father to Sir Thomas More's sister. Surely there is no reason to reject Peacham's statement that Heywood also owned fair possessions there.

The pardon furthermore raises the interesting question of the dramatist's birthplace. Reed, Fairholt (*Percy Soc.*, XX, p. i), and Swoboda (*Heywood als Dramatiker*, pp. 11–13) decide in favor of North Mimms; John Pits (cf. *Eng. Stud.*, XXXVIII, 237) and Hazlitt (Dodsley's *Old Plays*, I, 325) credit London with being the place of his birth; Ward (*D.N.B.*, XXVI, 331) and Chambers (*Med. Stage*, II, 443) do not decide between the two places; and Pollard (*Rep. Eng. Comedies*, p. 3) affirms that the tradition of Heywood's birth at North Mimms apparently arose from his owning land there.

The pardon certainly shows that Heywood resided at North Mimms at one time or another. If he resided in London from January, 1515, when he is first mentioned in connection with the court, until the date of his pardon, then his youthful residence at North Mimms would fit in with the tradition that he first met Sir Thomas there and with the assertions of Stapleton and Pits that he had been for many years familiar with More. Bang (*Eng. Stud.*, XXXVIII, 246) is inclined to think that Heywood received his property at North Mimms through his marriage with Eliza Rastell. This is possible, but it is perhaps more probable that he inherited it from his own relatives. It is perhaps worth while to note in this connection that Heywood's father-in-law, John Rastell, at least died poor, leaving to his son William only 40*s.* and to John Rastell, Jr., a small annuity (Duff, *Westminster and London Printers*, p. 185).

How narrowly he had escaped is brought out by Wriothesley (*Chronicle*, I, 148): "The 6 day of July Hayward recanted his treason at Pawles Crosse, which had bene afore condempned to death and brought to be layd on the hardell for denyinge the supremacye of the Kinges Majestie against the Bishop of Rome." Just why Heywood was pardoned at the last minute does not appear.[1] He does not seem to have been further disturbed during Henry's reign. On December 25, 1545, he was paid his quarter wages of 50*s.* as "player on the virginals" (*L. and P.*, XX, Pt. 2, p. 515); and a John Heywood, perhaps the dramatist, was holding crown land in tenure during the years 1545 and 1546.[2]

The experiences of Heywood and his group during the reign of Edward VI are not altogether clear. Under February 7, 1550, Wriothesley wrote in his *Chronicle* (*Camden Soc.*, II, 34) that the sheriffs of London had seized upon the houses of the "ranke Papistes" Anthony Bonvise, Doctor Clement, physician, Balthasar, surgeon, and Rastell "which maryed Doctor Clementes daughter because they had fled the realme and conveyed theyr cheife substance and goodes out of the realme." In some cases more exact information is possible with respect to the process referred to above.

Balthasar is of course Guersie who has been implicated in the Kentish troubles of 1543. I have not learned the exact date of his departure from England or the cause of his flight. In all probability

[1] As was said above, Morice states that the pardon of the offenders was secured through great exertion of their friends. A passage in Sir John Harington's *Metamorphosis of Ajax*, p. 41, is of interest here. "What think you," he asks, "by Haywood, that escaped hanging with his mirth? The king, graciously and (as I think) truly persuaded that a man that wrote so pleasant and harmless verses, could not have any harmful conceit against his proceedings; and so by the honest motion of a gentleman of his chamber, saved him from the jerk of the six stringed whip." Ward (*D.N.B.*, XXVI, 331) follows Oldys and Fairholt in referring Harington's allusion to an incident during the reign of Edward VI. This, however, is wrong, since Harington is obviously speaking of Henry VIII. Ward further remarks that Harington has confused the Six Articles ("six stringed whip") and the Act of Supremacy. This may be the case, yet it is possible that he really meant what he said. Heywood and his fellows got into trouble indirectly at least as a result of the Six Articles. How Harington might have been misled by Heywood's experiences in 1544 is perhaps illustrated by a more modern blunder. Forgetting that Heywood recanted in 1544 and that Edward VI died in 1553, the writer of the unsigned article on Heywood in the eleventh edition of the *Encyclopedia Britannica* has the startling assertion: "Under Edward VI, he [Heywood] was accused of denying the King's supremacy over the church, and had to make a public recantation in 1554."

[2] *L. and P.*, XX, Pt. I, p. 661; Pt. 2, p. 545; XXI, Pt. 1, p. 243.

he left about the same time that Rastell and Clement fled and for very similar reasons.[1]

On September 25, 1549, Anthony Bonvise "craftely and rebelliously took flight to Antwerp[2] with all his family," his brother Benedict having departed for the same place without license on April 5, 1548.[3] Perhaps foreseeing trouble, Anthony by an indenture dated July 4, 1547, had granted Crosby Hall and other property to "Richard Heywood, and John Webbs, gentlemen, and their heirs to the use of the said Anthony for his life." After Bonvise's decease the property was to pass "to the use of Peter Gowte and his heirs; for default, to the use of Anthony Roper, son of Wm. Roper, Esq. and his heirs."[4] The reason for his flight and an account of his life abroad are given by Sander:[5]

> Seeing even the traces of the Catholic faith being removed from England, he went to live in the University of Louvain, not indeed to carry on his business as a merchant of this world, but to attend to the business of the next. There he gathered around him and comforted those who were in exile for the faith, especially the physician John Clement and his wife, John Storey Nicholas Harpsfield John Boxall and the lawyer, Wm. Rastell, with his wife, who died in Louvain.

Perhaps on account of his high position, his former intimacy with More,[6] his close friendship with Pole,[7] and his activity regarding the much-debated question of the Sacrament, Dr. Clement seems to have been especially distasteful to the Reformers. In a reply, May 18, 1560, to a letter of Cole, Jewel accused Clement of tearing out and casting into the fire certain leaves of Theodoret (*Works, Parker*

[1] Balthasar returned to England during the reign of Mary, and on December 22, 1556, he was admitted a fellow to the College of Physicians. He was buried on January 10, 1558 (Munk, I, 57).

[2] *Inquisitiones post Mortem for London*, ed. Fry, I, 115.

[3] *Ibid.*, p. 116.

[4] *Inquisitiones post Mortem*, I, 183. This passage is of interest in showing the intimate connection between Bonvise and the More circle. Was the Richard Heywood mentioned above a brother of the dramatist? For other references to him, see *L. and P.*, XX, Pt. I, p. 309; XXI, Pt. I, p. 648.

[5] *The Anglican Schism*, pp. 201–2. Bonvise does not seem to have returned to England during the reign of Mary (cf. *Cal. State Papers, Domestic*, 1547–80, p. 67; *ibid., Foreign*, 1553–58, pp. 197, 212, 367). He died at Louvain on December 7, 1558.

[6] Gillow, *Bibliog. Dict. of Eng. Catholics*, I, 499.

[7] Cf. especially the letter written by Pole to Genova in behalf of Thos. Clement, an English law student and the son of Pole's "old and very dear friend" (*Cal. State Papers, Venetian*, 1555–56, pp. 393–94).

Soc., I, 52); and in his *Apology* (printed 1562) he explains that this event took place "but few years past" in the presence of "certain honest men" including Peter Martyr. The destroyed leaves, we are informed, taught that "the nature of bread in the communion is not changed or abolished, or brought to nothing" (*ibid.*, IV, 785–86). This accusation probably began in 1549 when Martyr was causing such a stir at Oxford about the Sacrament; and it may have had something to do with Clement's flight. Harding's reply to the *Apology* (printed 1564) contains a vehement denial of any such irreverence to old texts by the doctor and former teacher of Greek, a denial, however, which does not seem to have satisfied Jewel.[1] Clement probably left[2] England in December, 1549, at the same time when his son-in-law fled with "his whole family" to Louvain "contrary to the allegiance which he owed the King, deceitfully and rebelliously."[3]

Adequate motives for the flight of Clement and Rastell in the fall of 1549 are not easily found. It is not at all probable that either had been implicated in the revolts of the previous summer, or had violated the Act of Uniformity, which had become operative at Pentecost.[4] The best explanation appears to be that, seeing with the fall of Somerset in October and the reconsideration of religious matters by the parliament which met on November 4, a beginning of the end of the short era of comparative religious freedom[5] which England had enjoyed under Edward VI, they were unwilling to take any chances with the new order of things owing to their former activities in behalf of Catholicism, and therefore voluntarily left

[1] *Works* of Jewel, IV, 786.

[2] Together with Pole, Dr. Story, Guersie and a few others he was exempted from the general pardon granted by Edward VI in 1552 (Gillow, *Bibliog., Dict. of Eng. Catholics*, I, 499). On August 28, 1552, an inventory was taken of his goods remaining in the house of Marshfoot in the parish of Horn-church, Essex (*Cal. State Papers, Domestic*, 1547–80, p. 44). He returned to England in March, 1554, and practised his profession in Essex, but after Elizabeth's accession he again went abroad, where he died, July 1, 1572 (Joseph Foster, *Alumni Oxienses*, I, 289). In a memorandum drawn up in 1576 by the College of Physicians, "Dr. Clement at Louvain" is instanced among the "electors who have fled for religion out of the realme [but who] have been kept in their offices until they died" (Birt, *Eliz. Religious Settlement*, p. 445).

[3] An inquisition of February 27, 1551, states that Rastell fled on December 21, 1549, whereas another one gives December 1 as the date of the flight (*Inquisitiones post Mortem*, I, 109, 116).

[4] Dodd, *Church History* (ed. Tierney), II, 31–32, and appendix.

[5] A. F. Pollard, *Eng. under Somerset*, chap. iv; cf. also his *Life of Cranmer*, pp. 258–60.

their native land[1] without the royal permission. This, however, would hardly explain Bonvise's leaving in September.

Having profited, perhaps, by his experience under Henry VIII, Heywood seems to have avoided trouble during the reign of Edward VI, a period marked by comparatively little religious persecution. According to Puttenham, the epigrammatist was "well benefited" by Edward for the "myrth and quicknesse of his conceits"; and the same author further states that he was a great favorite of John Dudley, duke of Northumberland (*Percy Soc.*, XX, p. vii). The good will of Dudley would surely account for the lack of any trouble at this period, though it is just a little odd that one who showed favor to Knox and other reformers should have been especially gracious to the Catholic Heywood. But Northumberland, it must be remembered, was a reformer for political reasons; and at the time of his execution in August, 1553, he recanted, avowing himself a strong Catholic. If Puttenham's statement is to be accepted at all, then we must at least suppose that any intimacy between Heywood and Dudley ceased at the accession of Mary, certainly before the unfortunate events that resulted in the death of the duke and Lady Jane Grey. Possibly the famous epigram *Of Rebellion*, in which Heywood deftly vows his loyalty to the queen under all circumstances,

[1] Rastell returned to England during Mary's reign. In October, 1555, he was made sergeant at law (Foss, *Judges of Eng.*, V, 535) and on October 25, 1558, he was appointed to the Queen's Bench (*Cal. State Papers, Domestic*, 1547–80, p. 107). On the day after Elizabeth's accession all judges were reappointed regardless of their religion (Foss, V, 536). On February 23, 1559, Rastell was appointed by the queen a "Justice Itinerant and of the assizes in the Counties of Durham and Sadberg" (*Cal. State Papers, Domestic*, 1547–80, p. 122). He incurred the enmity of Pilkington (Pilkington, *Works, Parker Soc.*, p. 628); and on May 3, 1560, Bishop Young wrote rather warmly to Parker that "Mr. Serjeant Rastell" and Mr. Warner [Jno. Warner, Warden of All Soul's] had exerted themselves extravagantly in behalf of "Thos. Clement whose prebend Mr. Gwynne now has" (*Parker Correspondence*, p. 114). For reasons which it is unnecessary to give here I believe that this Thos. Clement was Rastell's brother-in-law. On January 3, 1562 (not 1563 as is sometimes said), Rastell left England without the royal license, and his property, including his library, was forfeited to the crown (Douthwaite, *Gray's Inn*, p. 172; *Law Magazine*, February, 1844 [XXXI], pp. 55–60). It is generally supposed that he fled on account of his religion, but this is by no means certain. The Inns of Court and lawyers in general were not seriously molested during the first years of Elizabeth's reign; and a passage in a letter of January 17, 1562, written by Bishop Quadra to the Spanish king, is of interest in this connection. "The cause of his going," writes the bishop, "although it is publicly said to be on account of religion, I am told by some of his friends is to avoid signing an opinion which seven or eight lawyers are to give on the succession to the crown." The object of the plan, explains Quadra, was to exclude the Scots Queen and Lady Margaret and to secure ultimately a monarch sufficiently "heretic" (*Cal. State Papers, Spanish*, 1558–67, p. 224). Rastell died in Louvain, August 27, 1565.

was the result of his former connection with Northumberland. Whatever may have been his position, it is certain that the dramatist remained undisturbed in England under Edward. Between October 1 of the second year of his reign and October 1 of the ensuing year four quarter wages of 50*s.* to "John Haiwood plaier on the Virginalles" are recorded in the King's Book of Receipts and Payments;[1] and in the early part of 1553 a play "of children" was "set out by Heywood" at court.[2]

It is unnecessary to rehearse the prosperity of Heywood under Mary. Rather full accounts are to be found in Ward's article in *D.N.B.* and in Swaboda's *Heywood als Dramatiker*. A question more in point is his relation to the religious settlement under Elizabeth.

Perhaps misled by Anthony à Wood's vague assertion[3] that Heywood *after* Mary's death "left the nation for religion sake," scholars[4] have generally assumed that this took place immediately after the queen's decease on November 17, 1558. There is every reason to believe, however, that Heywood remained in England for a considerable time after the accession of Elizabeth. In Machyn's *Diary* (*Camden Soc.*, p. 206) the following passage appears:

> The V day of August [i.e., 1559] the Queen(s) grace removyed from Eltham unto Non-shyche, my lord of Arundell(s), and ther her grace had as gret cher evere nyght, and bankettes; but the Sonday at nyght my lord of Arundell(s) house mad her a gret bankett at ys cost, the wyche Kyng Henry the VIII byldyd, as ever was sene, for soper, bankett, and maske, with drumes and flutes, and all the mysyke that cold be, tyll mydnyght; and as for chere has nott bene sene nor hard. [On Monday] the Queen('s) grace stod at her standying [in the further park] and ther was corse after; and at nyght the Queen and a play of the chylderyn of Powlles and ther master Se[bastian], master Phelypes, and master Haywood, and after a grett bankett, etc.

It is curious that Strype, who consulted MS Cotton Vitellius, F. V. "when it was perfect," should have omitted "Master Haywood" in virtually transcribing the passage above.[5] All things

[1] *Trevelyan Papers* (*Camden Soc.*), Pt. 2, pp. 18, 25, 31, 33.

[2] *Loseley Manuscripts*, ed. Kempe, pp. 89–90.

[3] *Athen. Oxon.*, ed. Bliss, I, 349.

[4] Ward, however, says at the accession of Elizabeth "or later" (*D.N.B.*, XXVI, 332).

[5] *Annals of the Reformation* (ed. 1824), I, Pt. 1, p. 290. For examples of Strype's carelessness see Nichols' preface to Machyn's *Diary*, p. vi. Strype, and not Machyn, has been followed with respect to this passage. Cf. for example, Nichols, *Prog. of Eliz.* (ed. 1823), I, 74; Collier, *Drama*,[2] I, 169.

considered, however, there seems to be no reason for doubting the authenticity of this reference to "Master Haywood's" presence at Nonsuch in August, 1559, or for believing that the person referred to here is any other than the one who at various times before this date is associated with the entertainments by Children at Court. And why assume that Heywood left England for "conscience sake" immediately after Elizabeth's accession? There was virtual religious freedom at least until June 24, 1559, when the Act of Uniformity became operative (Birt, pp. 23–26); and as late as November 16 of the same year the Reformation was decidedly uncertain (*ibid.*, pp. 174–75). True, the Act of Supremacy had caused some agitation before this date, but comparatively few people seem to have fled.[1] If he was connected with St. Paul's, as seems probable, then Heywood must have experienced the Southern Visitation which began on August 11, 1559, when the Visitors sat in the chapter house of St. Paul's (Machyn, p. 206). By *experienced* I do not mean that he conformed. He could have been absent, as some were, or have refused subscription to the Acts of Supremacy and Uniformity without causing himself serious difficulty for the time being at least. That this visitation, as indeed that of July 1562, was mild and accompanied by few deprivations is abundantly proved.[2] As one example of the comparative leniency of the first years of Elizabeth's reign, the experiences of Sebastian Westcote may be cited at this point. His case was perhaps not exactly a typical one, yet on account of the association of his name[3] with that of Heywood by Machyn and his connection with dramatic history, one is perhaps justified in inserting here a brief account of his adventures with the reformation under Elizabeth.

At the St. Paul's Visitation of August, 1559, Westcote refused to comply with the Acts of Uniformity and Supremacy,[4] and on

[1] On May 10, 1559, Bishop of Aquila after stating that the Oath of Supremacy was to be administered at once to the English bishops, who are ordered not to leave London, continues: "An infinite number of people would leave the country if they would let them, which they will not, and I am not sure whether they are wise in this" (*Cal. State Papers, Spanish*, 1558–67, p. 69).

[2] Gee, *Eliz. Clergy*, pp. 117, 131; Birt, *Eliz. Relig. Settlement*, p. 171; Frere, *Eng. Church under Eliz. and Jas.*

[3] Machyn's "Master Phelypes" is probably Robert Phillips, the famous singer (Hawkins, *Hist. of Music*, I, 450), who is mentioned in a list of the Gentlemen of the Chapel supposedly drawn up in the reign of Edward VI (Stopes, *Wm. Hunnis and the Children of the Chapel*, pp. 21, 23).

[4] Strype, I, 251; Birt, p. 171.

November 3 of the same year he was given until the next sitting to make his decision.[1] In the meantime he was, according to the *Novum Repetorium*,[2] appointed, in 1560, sub-dean or first minor canon of St. Paul's. Apparently nothing was done to him at the Visitation of 1561; and in August, 1563, Grindal in a letter to Dudley states that Westcote had been deprived (in July) only after every effort had been exerted to induce him to subscribe.[3] "He was," says Birt (pp. 441–42), "Master of the Choir of St. Paul's, hence his influence among the choristers had to be counteracted or removed; he remained in London, doubtless under the protection of Lord Dudley, and in 1577 was returned as living under the shadow of his old home in 'St. Gregory's by Paul's,' and is still called Master of the Children of Paul's Church, being valued at 100 pounds in goods." In a list of "Prisoners in the Marshalsea," Westcote is described[4] among "Papists at Liberty" as "sent in by commandment from the honorable lords of the Consell for papistry 21 December Anno 1577 and was discharged by my sayd lords of the counscell the 19 daye of Marche Anno 1577 [1578]." His deprivation was obviously confined to his sub-deanship, since he is regularly the payee for the Paul's Children at Court performances from Christmas 1561/2 to Christmas, 1581.[5]

Before returning to Heywood, it will be well to note a few points in connection with his sons, Ellis and Jasper, and their movements during the first years of Elizabeth's reign. The *Dictionary of National Biography* (XXVI, 329) states that after being admitted B.C.L. at Oxford, July 18, 1552, Ellis Heywood was opposed to the Reformers, and hence withdrew to the Continent where he was received into the family of Cardinal Pole, becoming later a secretary to him. According to the same work, Ellis does not seem to have accompanied the cardinal to England during Mary's reign. I am not sure about all this, for whereas Pole did not arrive in London until November 24, 1554, an Ellizeus Heywood, A.M., was admitted

[1] Strype, *Annals*, I, 253.

[2] Ed. of Hennessy, p. 61.

[3] *Remains of Grindal, Parker Soc.*, p. 262.

[4] *Catholic Record Soc., Miscellanea*, I, 70.

[5] E. K. Chambers, *Mod. Lang. Review*, II, 4–9; Fleay, *Chron. Hist.*, pp. 15–19; Stopes, *William Hunnis*, pp. 319–21.

prebend at Eccleshall, Lichfield, on June 22 of the same year (Le Neve, *Fasti Ecclesiae*, I, 601). He was perhaps not in England at the time of Elizabeth's accession. In 1556, he was residing in Florence where his *Il Moro d'Heliseo* was published in that year; and in 1559 he was probably a student in Paris, since on August 1, 1559, Throckmorton wrote[1] to Cecil: "Here are arrived two gentlemen from Italy, Mr. Phitzwilliam and Mr. Haywood, who remain as students at Paris." He entered the Society of Jesus in 1566;[2] and he had returned to his native land before 1573 when he came from England to Anvers.[3]

In discussing the 1559 Visitation at Oxford, C. G. Robertson[4] writes that Jasper Heywood, a Fellow of All Soul's, probably had to leave the college in June on account of his religion. This is the accepted view. It is not at all likely, however, that Jasper was forced to leave at that time. In the first place, he is not mentioned along with the two Fellows who were expelled in June, 1559, for noncompliance. Oxford was especially noted for its strong Catholic sympathies; and the authorities recognizing this fact had the visitors of 1559 make a "mild and gentle, not rigorous, reformation" (Gee, *Eliz. Clergy*, pp. 131, 174–75). Nor was it until 1564 that real pressure was brought to bear by the Reformers upon Oxford.[5] Again, if Jasper had been expelled in 1559, then it is rather strange that he should have dedicated his *Thyestes* (Pub. 1560) to Sir John Mason who on June 20, 1559, was elected chancellor of Oxford and who was one of the Visitors for that year (Birt, p. 272). Nor should we expect to find the *Hercules Furens* (published in 1561) dedicated to Wm. Herbert, ardent favorer of a zealous Protestant revival and member of the committee in 1558 to discuss ecclesiastical conditions with the queen. All things considered, we can feel rather sure that Heywood's leaving Oxford was not the result of compulsion. In 1561 he was admitted into Gray's Inn,[6] and deciding to become a priest, he left England—probably with his uncle, Wm. Rastell,

[1] *Cal. State Papers, Foreign*, 1558–59, pp. 434, 436.

[2] H. Foley, *Records of the Eng. Province of the Soc. of Jesus*, I, 388.

[3] *Eng. Stud.*, XXXVIII, 236.

[4] *Hist. of All Soul's College*, p. 67.

[5] Birt, pp. 278, 507, etc.; Frere, *Eng. Church under Eliz. and Jas.*, pp. 65–66.

[6] Joseph Foster, *Register of Admissions to Gray's Inn*, p. 29.

on February 3, 1562. Having been ordained abroad,[1] he was on May 21, 1562, admitted to the Society of Jesus at Rome.[2]

It would not be surprising to find that John Heywood remained in England as long as his son and brother-in-law. And there is some slight evidence that he remained as long, even longer. In 1562 Thomas Powell issued the *Epigrams* with a "newly added syxt hundred" "newly invented and made by John Heywood." No. 62 of these reads

> Thanks to God and good people Powles goeth up well:
> Powles goeth up? but when goeth polling down; that tell.

This seems to be an allusion to the rebuilding by public subscription of St. Paul's, struck by lightning and partially destroyed on June 4, 1561 (Machyn, p. 259). The work of rebuilding was considered a national duty. Large contributions were offered for the work, and within a month after the fire all four of the great roofs were covered with a slight roof of wood and lead to keep out the rain. On November 1, 1561, the lord mayor, aldermen, and all the crafts of the city went in state to hear the sermon at the famous cathedral; and before the end of the year "all the long rooffes were raysed of new and strong timber."[3] If the lines above are a reference to the rebuilding of St. Paul's, then it is hardly such as would have been made by a fugitive in Malines.

Less convincing is another reference. Strype[4] after stating that he omits the "names of the lesser Canons, and of the Vicars choral" who were present at the Visitation of St. Paul's in April, 1561, goes on to say that the Visitors adjourned until the following May 29, "at which time also appeared Whitbroke, Lake, Haywood, and Pen, Minor Canons," arraigned about their marriage. After a consideration as to what should be done with them,

it was found by ordinances of the Dean formerly made, that married Canons should not be bound to be present at the common table in their college of petty canons, but should be permitted to be by themselves with their families,

[1] Gee, *Eliz. Clergy*, p. 268.

[2] For his return to England in 1581 and his experiences there, see *D.N.B.*, XXVI: Law, *Jesuits and Seculars in the Reign of Eliz.; Catholic Record Soc., Miscellanea*, I, 111–12; *ibid.*, IV and V; Foley, *Records of Soc. of Jesus*, I, 388.

[3] Machyn, pp, 260, 262; Hayward, *Annals of Eliz.*, p. 89.

[4] *Life of Grindal*, pp. 88–89.

and to have convenient victuals; and that beside in all dividends and common profits, the same should be had of the married as of others. And of these orders the Bishop approved.

Who is this "Heywood," married minor canon? The nearest approach to the name given in the *Novum repetorium* is "John Hayward," who was appointed junior cardinal or third minor canon in 1566 (ed. of Hennessy, p. 63). And who is John Hayward?

At least the close relationship between minor canons and the choir[1] and the various suggestions of Heywood's association with the Paul's Children rather tend to support the assumption that in 1561 he was actually a minor canon of St. Paul's. If it be urged that minor canons *ought* to be priests, then it may be said that there is nothing conclusive against believing that Heywood had taken orders by 1561. The careers of his sons and the expression "votre vénéré père" used in describing his admission into the Jesuit College at Anvers in 1576[2] are at least not opposed to any such supposition. One of the "Jests" as given by Warton[3]-Hazlitt is as follows: "When Queene Mary tolde Heywoode that the priestes must forego their wives, he merrily answered: Then your grace must allow them lemmans, for the clergie cannot live without sauce." Possibly his having taken holy orders would explain more adequately why the queen should be talking to him about such matters. On the other hand, it is not easy to reconcile John Heywood, married priest, with the John Heywood, who is said to have been a sort of official jester to the Catholic Mary. And owing to the prominence of the name "Heywood" in ecclesiastical affairs of the time,[4] one is surely not justified in stressing Strype's vague reference.

My remoteness from documents that would perhaps settle the matter is my excuse for other conjectures. Heywood, John Pits

[1] See *Novum repetorium*, ed. of Hennessy, p. 59; Wilkins, *Concilia*, III, 134–35.

[2] *Eng. Stud.*, XXXVIII, 236.

[3] *Hist. Eng. Poetry*, IV, 80, note 3.

[4] Jno. Bridgewater, says Bang (*Eng. Stud.*, XXXVIII, 235), has in the index of persons to his *Concertatio Ecclesiae* a John Heywood "Sacerdos" in addition to "Joan Heiuodus N[obilis] obijt E[xul]." Is Bridgewater's "Sacerdos" the John Hayward who aided Parsons? (see above). A "Thos. Haywoode," monk at St. Osith's, Essex, was pensioned in 1540 (*L. and P.*, XV, 542); a "Thos. Heiwood" officiated at the wedding of Wm. Bel and Dorothy Daniel, May 7, 1582 (*Catholic Record Soc., Miscellanea*, I, 119); a "Stephen Heywood" was granted a pension in 1534 on the dissolution of Byndon Abbey (*L. and P.*, XIV, Pt. 1, p. 519); in 1574 Oliver and Thos. Heiwood, priests, were apprehended at Mass (Holinshed, *Chronicle*, IV, 324–25).

seems to say, "extat Londini anno Domini 1576." And Bang[1] asks: "Wohl nur druckfehler für 1556?" The date 1576 is impossible; yet I am inclined to ask whether Bang's 1556 is only a *druckfehler* for 1565 or 1566 or 1567. At least I am not convinced that Heywood left England before 1567. *The Recantation of Famous Pasquin of Rome*, published in 1570 by John Daye,[2] contains a reference to Heywood and other "Louanistes" who "ran away." In 1573 he was living at Malines,[3] "venu d'Angleterre, persécuté pour la foi"; hence in all probability he was the same person who on April 18, 1575, wrote to Burghley from that place "'where I have been despoiled by Spanish and German soldiers of the little I had', and thanking him for ordering the arrears from his land at Romney to be paid to him, and speaking of himself as an old man of seventy-eight."[4] Burghley's good will, implied in this letter, would help to explain Heywood's prolonged stay in England. He was, an octogenarian, admitted in 1576 to the Jesuit College at Anvers,[5] and in a list made out on January 29, 1576/7, "of all such as are certified into the Exchequer to be fugitives over the seas, contrary to the stat. 13 Eliz.," John Heywood holding land in Kent is included as being resident at Louvain.[6] This document used by Collier is, as Birt has pointed out,[7] evidently a copy of a former one of December 26, 1576. The statute referred to is the act known as "13 Eliz. Cap. 3" passed in 1570 against fugitive or "fleeing" Papists and "depriving them of their lands and possessions, and nullifying any transfer they may have made thereof in order to escape any such confiscation." Since the property thus passing into the crown's possession became ready incentive to Elizabethan graft, lists of fugitives were eagerly sought after. If Heywood fled early, it is, therefore, probable that his name occurs in some list anterior to that of December 26, 1576. Perhaps he left England as a result of the active hostility to Catholics which accompanied the rebellion of 1569 and which perhaps found fullest expression in the stringent parliamentary acts (13 Eliz. Cap.

[1] *Eng. Stud.*, XXXVIII, 238.
[2] Corser, *Collectanea Anglo-Poetica*, Pt. I, p. 83.
[3] *Eng. Stud.*, XXXVIII, 236.
[4] *D.N.B.*, XXVI, 332.
[5] *Eng. Stud.*, XXXVIII, 236.
[6] Collier, *Bibliog. Catalogue*, I, 39.
[7] *Eliz. Relig. Settlement*, p. 545.

2 and 3) of 1570. At any rate there is no especial reason for believing that during the first years of Elizabeth's reign John Heywood who apparently had twice taken the Oath of Supremacy in Henry VIII's time and who had prosperously survived the reign of Edward VI should have been "persécuté pour la foi."

So much for conjecture. The whole question, I believe, can be settled by a study of the unpublished lists of Papists which are preserved in the Public Record Office and which Birt has so ably used in his book on the religious settlement under Elizabeth. From such documents certain facts regarding the social position, property, and whereabouts of Heywood would perhaps be gleaned, together with other facts concerning various members of the Heywood circle.

NOTE.—After the preceding article was in type my attention was called to Professor C. W. Wallace's *Evolution of the English Drama*, which appeared some time after my paper was announced. Professor Wallace has found new facts regarding Heywood's appointment as server to his Majesty's chamber; and he has noted most of the references above to grants, etc., to "John Heywood," which he believes refer in all cases to the dramatist. For reasons already given I prefer to be somewhat more conservative.

This is not the place to discuss Professor Wallace's unconvincing assignment to Cornish of various plays usually credited to Heywood, but it may be said that Heywood's "uncompromising" Catholicism, necessary for such procedure, is surely questionable, as, I think, the preceding pages show. Professor Wallace writes (p. 83) that Heywood as a result of this "uncompromising Catholicism" left England immediately after Elizabeth's accession; and on page 84, in noting that Heywood is associated with Westcote and the Paul's Boys at the Hatfield House entertainment of 1552, he asserts positively that Heywood could not have been connected with Paul's. Yet, strange to say, he fails to discuss in this connection Heywood's association with the same man and boys at Nonsuch in August, 1559, as given in the Camden Society edition of Machyn's *Diary*. Nevertheless he cites (p. 105, note 4) Machyn's *Diary* in connection with this latter entertainment, while in his Table (p. 199) he refers the reader to the account of the entertainment as found in Nichols' *Progresses of Queen Elizabeth*, where the reference to Heywood is not found. If Professor Wallace has evidence to show that the allusion to "Master Heywode" is a later addition in the Camden Society edition of Machyn (cf. my discussion of this point above), then of course this circumstance will probably modify somewhat my views.

T. S. GRAVES

UNIVERSITY OF WASHINGTON